

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/798,270	Applicant(s) CHOO ET AL.	
	Examiner ADAM R. GIESY	Art Unit 2627	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ADAM R. GIESY. (3) Paul Daebeler.

(2) Wayne Young. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 11/6/2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,9,17,25 and 33.

Identification of prior art discussed: Goldstein, Koudo, and Choi.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner concedes that the amendment submitted on 10/29/2008 would overcome the prior art of record. The amendment, however will not be entered after final since the scope of the claims have changed which will warrant further search and consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Adam R. Giesy/ Examiner, Art Unit 2627	/Wayne Young/ SPE, Art Unit 2627
--	-------------------------------------